



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS

mination. Luther's "Here I stand, God help me, I cannot do otherwise," expresses what is typical of all conduct.

There is a tradition which identifies this with the destruction of all responsibility. Men being the effects of time and place, their sins and virtues are only the sins and virtues of time and place, and for such, reward or punishment become meaningless and irrelevant. This position involves, however, a confusion of the determinism of *explanation* with the determinism of *valuation*. But it is clear that the origins of a thing are not identical with its goodness or turpitude; nor the standards of conduct with the causes of conduct. Now social standards are applied to personality, and an individual is responsible for his actions insofar as these flow from his integrated personality. "Personality must be held responsible for those actions only which it has the power to effectuate" (p. 24). This is all that is meant by the "free will" of the law books. All willing which lies outside of this would be abnormal. Men are responsible, normally, only in so far as they are able to do what they *should*, and "to be able" is to be free.

Thus determinism and indeterminism are both harmonized and the law vindicated. But the harmony and vindication are the results of a historic sophism concerning the radical difference between causation and valuation. In terms of evolution valuations are themselves both effects and causes, and do not belong to a different universe of discourse. They can be so understood only as a methodological artifice and not ultimately. Ultimately your value to me is your intrinsic and instrumental effect on my life. That is entirely the summation of your history. Your value will vary with your history, and the two cannot be divorced. As the difference between the two is the crux of this monograph, the monograph fails as a philosophic defense of certain legal conventions.

University of Wisconsin.

H. M. KALLEN.

PRISON LABOR IN THE PARTY PLATFORM OF 1911-1912. Prison Labor Leaflets Number Seven. National Committee on Prison Labor, New York. Pp. 26. 10 cents.

The direction of public opinion on the question of convict labor is well set forth in Prison Labor Leaflet Number Seven, of the National Committee on Prison Labor. This pamphlet is composed of excerpts from the party platforms in state and nation during the campaigns of 1911 and 1912. Judged by this evidence, there seems to be a fairly uniform demand for two reforms, namely, the abolition of the contract system of employing convicts, and the payment of the earnings of the prisoner to his dependants, or in some cases, to the prisoner himself at the expiration of his term. In place of the contract system some form of state use is recommended, as the building of public roads, or the production of such articles as are used by the state, county or municipal institutions.

These reforms are not the proposals of any one party, as they have been adopted in one or more of the states by all four of the leading parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive and Socialist—although they

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS

appear with greater frequency in the Socialist and Progressive platforms than in those of the other two parties. However, the proposals can not be regarded solely as socialist measures, as the Democrats include at least one of the proposals in nine, the Republicans in ten, and the Progressives in thirteen state platforms. In addition to this all of the parties except the Republicans had a clause touching upon these reforms in their national party platforms in the campaign of 1912.

Two ideas can be perceived as the basis for the demand for these measures. The first is humane and reformatory. It has in view the adaptation of the criminal during his period of imprisonment to organized society, and his restoration at the expiration of his term a useful member of society. To do this it is necessary to equip the convict with the means of meeting the economic competition which he has to encounter when he again becomes a free man. This requires some form of industrial and educational training. It is also advocated to pay him wages over and above his keep, partly to relieve society from caring for his dependants and partly to enable the prisoner to re-establish himself when freed. The Socialists in two states—Montana and Nebraska—demand the payment of wages at the union scale for the same kind of work which is paid at the point nearest to the prison.

The second idea is to prevent the competition between prison and free labor. For years organized labor has opposed the entrance of prison made goods upon the competitive markets as a means of lowering wages. In attempting to remove this menace to the conditions of the working classes, organized labor has not always seen clearly, nor has it at all times advocated a consistent plan. However, the effects of the competition of prison made goods have been real evils. Conclusive evidence has been repeatedly presented to show that competition did exist and that its obvious effect was injurious to free labor. But it is not quite clear to the reviewer just how the use of convict labor in the production of articles used exclusively by the state and other public institutions completely relieves free labor from this competition. For articles thus made would otherwise have to be purchased by these institutions from the productive efforts of free labor, unless it can be conclusively shown that the articles made by the convicts under the state use system would not otherwise have been brought into existence, and that therefore society gets the benefit of the productive efforts of the convicts which would have been lost had the convicts not been employed in this way. The argument of organized labor on this question of the competition with free labor is, in fact, only a phase of "the-lump-of-work" argument, which has played so large a part in the reasoning of laborers on all questions of production.

The question of convict labor has other phases than that of the competition with free labor. Society owes some responsibilities to the criminal, and besides it must assume the responsibility of protecting itself against those who do not conform to the laws of organized society. These responsibilities must be reckoned with in dealing with the problem of convict labor. To the laborer as a wage earner, in distinction to

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS

his interest as a member of society along with the rest of the community, the important consideration is that the productive efforts of convicts shall not be used as an immediate means of undermining his efforts to improve the working conditions of free labor. That competition will continue to exist, there can be little doubt. Therefore free labor is primarily concerned with the administrative control of convict labor. It has a right to demand how and under what conditions convict labor is to be used. The kind of work which organized labor suggests for convicts does, in most cases, have the advantage of ease of administration together with that of appearing not to enter into competition with the products of free labor. However, instances are not unknown where organized labor has remonstrated against the state's teaching convicts a trade other than they knew when imprisoned, on the ground that, when freed, these men would overstock the market and thus lower the wage scale. This argument was made by the printers, but might just as well have been made by any other craft, and it furnishes a clear instance of the statement above that, unless efforts of convicts be turned toward entirely new enterprises, it is impossible to escape competition with free labor, whatever the line of activity may be adopted.

However, the National Committee on Prison Labor is rendering a valuable service in bringing before the country in convenient form what is being done in respect to this important question.

Northwestern University.

F. S. DEIBLER.

THE BLOOD OF THE FATHERS. By *Dr. G. Frank Lydston*. (The River-ton Press, Chicago, 1912. Pp. 241.

Under the guise of drama, Dr. Lydston here sets forth strongly his ideas on the control and regulation of marriage. His plea for matrimonial discrimination is primarily a plea for the protection of society and of the unborn by the sterilization of degenerates, though the sterilization in the play itself is accomplished by the suicide of the socially unfit wife. The Doctor protests also against persecution of social outcasts, maintaining, as does John Galsworthy in his much stronger play, "Justice," that crime is a disease, just as pitiful as smallpox, and sometimes just as contagious; though some people will think that it is stretching a point in "The Blood of the Fathers" to insist that kleptomania may be inherited as readily as diseased blood, and in spite of a counter-active environment of good breeding, assured social position and perfect physique.

However that may be, we are coming at last to see that we must treat the criminal with all the patience and kindness and scientific remedies that we bestow upon his brother in the public hospital, who is suffering from deformities of bone tissue or from hereditary infection of the blood. They are all the same in origin; they are all the harvest of earlier ignorance, or sin, or mal-nutrition. Why show mercy to one, and shut the other up like an unclean animal, as if *he* did not need the sunshine and the care and the consideration infinitely more? In the author's own words, in the preface: